

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are pending; Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 12, and 13 have been amended; Claims 14-25 have been newly added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to; the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(b)(4); Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hemming (U.S. Pat. No. 4,218,683); and Claims 2 and 3 were objected to for informalities.

Regarding the objection to Claims 2 and 3, "form" has been amended to read "from." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these objections are overcome.

With regard to the objection to the specification, the specification has been amended at page 10, line 5, to clarify that the support 6 is provided with a screen 7. Additionally, the term "anechoid" chamber has been amended to read "anechoic" chamber. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, this objection has been overcome by the above-noted amendment to the specification at page 10, line 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed. The term "radiating element" has been removed from the claims, and replaced with the term "wave reception element." Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the specification at page 2, lines 7-14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

With regard to Claims 11 and 13, the term hyper-frequency is not a relative term, but is instead a term used by those skilled in the art to refer to the microwave frequency range. As a non-limiting example, the specification describes at page 14, lines 14-16 that this frequency range may include 16-31 GHz.

Finally, Claims 2 and 3 have also been amended to remove the noted informalities.

Accordingly, as Claims 1-3, 7, 10, 12, and 13 have been amended as described above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, that rejection is traversed. The Office Action states at pages 3-4 that the teaching of the movable carrying device being associated with the probe device of Claim 1 is not enabled by the disclosure. However, as described in the non-limiting description of the specification at page 3, lines 17-29, and as illustrated, for example, in Figure 1B, the probe device is associated with a movable carrying device 3. From the written description in the specification, as well as the accompanying drawings, for example Figures 1B and 3, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to make and use the movable carrying device recited, for example, in Claim 4. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hemming, that rejection is also traversed.

Claim 1 relates to a probe device for measuring characteristics of an electromagnetic field radiated by an electromagnetic source under testing conditions. To this end, Claim 1 recites that the device comprises a wave reception element, a support for the wave reception element, a probe mount on which the support is fastened, and a screen carried by the support and interposed between the wave reception element and the probe mount for reflecting beams impinging upon the screen to re-emit and scatter the beams as diverging beams into space.

Hemming relates to a range focus lens. In Figure 1 of Hemming, an anechoic chamber 10 has a point source antenna 12 and a test antenna 14. Hemming describes that the dielectric lens 16 is placed at a distance from the antenna 12. Spherical wave fronts 18 radiating from antenna 12 are converted to plane wave fronts 20 after passing through lens 16, according to Hemming.<sup>1</sup> The dielectric lens 16 and the absorber 30 are placed between source 12 and the test antenna 14. As described in Hemming, the dielectric lens 16 and the absorber 30 act as transmitting elements, *not reflective elements*, to convert the spherical wave fronts 18 radiated from the source 12 into plane wave fronts 20. The antenna 14 to be tested thereby receives a plane wave front. By contrast, as noted above, Claim 1 recites that the screen reflects and scatters the beams.

Additionally, in Hemming, the source 12 is not the element to be tested. Since the electromagnetic field radiated by the source 12 is converted into a plane wave front 20, the configuration of Hemming does not enable testing of the emitting source 12, but instead tests the test antenna 14. In contrast, as noted above, Claim 1 relates to testing an electromagnetic source (not a test antenna, as described by Hemming).

Furthermore, the Office Action appears to take Official Notice, at page 4, that Hemming includes a support means "satisfying the limitation of the support and probe mount," but no support was cited within Hemming for this assertion. That Official Notice is traversed and it is respectfully requested that a reference be cited to support this assertion, or that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the features of dependent Claim 2, since the lens 16 of Hemming transmits radiations, the re-emission of the beams must be along the central axis of symmetry (see, for example, wave front 20 in Figure 1 of Hemming), rather than away from the central axis, as recited in Claim 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hemming, col. 7, line 65 - col. 8, line 5.

Therefore, as Hemming fails to disclose or suggest the probe device recited in Claims 1 and 2, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 2 patentably distinguish over Hemming. Likewise, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 3-13 patentably distinguish over Hemming for the reasons above-noted with regard to Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Newly added Claims 14-25 recite features similar to those recited in Claims 1-10 and 12, and are supported by the original specification. Claims 14-25 are believed to distinguish over the references of record for reasons analogous to those set forth for Claims 1-10 and 12.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
GJM/SNS/KDP/cja/dmr

I:\ATTY\KDP\19'S\193337US\193337US-AM2 9-13-03 REV.DOC